UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.109/1159
1 July 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION
WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL
COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES

INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR THE ERADICATION OF COLONIALISM

PACIFIC REGIONAL SEMINAR TO REVIEW THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN THE SMALL ISLAND NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES, HELD AT PORT MORESBY, PAPUA NEW GUINEA, FROM 8 TO 10 JUNE 1993

Rapporteur: Mr. Eugene PURSOO (Grenada)

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
INTRODUCTION	1 - 4	3
I. ORGANIZATION OF THE SEMINAR	5 - 9	4
II. CONDUCT OF THE SEMINAR	10 - 71	6
A. Proceedings of the meetings	10 - 23	6
B. Summary of statements by representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories	24 - 71	8
III. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE SEMINAR	72	15

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Annexes

I. Statement by Mr. John R. Kaputin CMG MP, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea 23

II. Message from The Right Honourable Paias Wingti, Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea 33

III. List of participants 35

IV. Resolution of appreciation to the Government and people of Papua New Guinea 40

INTRODUCTION

1. At its forty-sixth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 46/181 of 19 December 1991 entitled "International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism", and the Plan of Action contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/46/634/Rev.1) "aimed at ushering in, in the twenty-first century, a world free from colonialism", in which, inter alia, it requested the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to:

> "organize during the Decade seminars in the Caribbean and Pacific regions alternately, as well as at United Nations Headquarters, to review the progress achieved in the implementation of the plan of action, with the participation of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, their elected representatives, the administering Powers, Member States, regional organizations, specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations and experts".

2. In its resolution 46/70 of 11 December 1991 calling for coordinated assistance of the specialized agencies to the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, the General Assembly stated that:

> "in addition to general problems facing developing countries, the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, many of which are small island Territories, also suffer handicaps arising from the interplay of such factors as their size, remoteness, geographical dispersion, vulnerability to natural disasters, the fragility of ecosystems, constraints in transport and communications, great distances from market centres, a highly limited internal market, lack of natural resources, weak indigenous technological capacity, the acute problem of obtaining freshwater supplies, heavy dependence on imports and a small number of commodities, depletion of non-renewable resources, migration, particularly of personnel with high-level skills, shortage of administrative personnel and heavy financial burdens".

3. As stated in the guidelines and rules of procedure for the Seminar (A/AC.109/1140), the primary objective of the Seminar was to address political, economic and social conditions in the small island Non-Self-Governing Territories of the Pacific region and assess the related situation in those Territories. The Seminar was also to identify areas in which the international community could increase and enhance its participation in programmes of assistance and development and adopt a comprehensive and integrated approach to ensure the viable and sustainable development of the Territories concerned.

4. The topics considered by the Seminar assisted the Special Committee in focusing its attention on the specific concerns of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories. In that connection, the Seminar gave pre-eminence to a broad range of views of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. It also secured the participation of special guests, particularly personalities who are actively involved in the economic, social and political development of the region, and of organizations and institutions that focus on

such development; of selected non-governmental organizations with long and established experience in island Territories; and of specialized agencies of the United Nations system, which have a special role to play in assisting the Special Committee in its future consideration of the remaining Territories.

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE SEMINAR

5. The Seminar was held at Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, from 8 to 10 June 1993.

6. The Seminar held six meetings in which representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, as well as eminent persons invited as special guests, took part (for further details, see annex III to the present report).

7. The Seminar was conducted by Mr. Renagi Renagi Lohia, Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations and Chairman of the Special Committee, with the participation of the following other members of the Special Committee: Chile, Czech Republic, Fiji, Grenada, Indonesia, Mali, Papua New Guinea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia.

8. At the 1st meeting, on 8 June 1993, the following representatives were appointed as officers of the Seminar: Mr. Andrew G. Bangali (Sierra Leone), Mr. José Manuel Ovalle (Chile), Mr. Semyon Dzakhaev (Russian Federation) and Mr. Faroukk Al-Attar (Syrian Arab Republic) as Vice-Chairmen and Mr. Eugene Pursoo (Grenada) as Rapporteur. Ratu Manasa Seniloli (Fiji) was appointed Chairman of the Drafting Committee. The Drafting Committee was open-ended.

9. The agenda of the Seminar contained the following topics:

1. <u>Political questions</u>

   (a) Self-determination: its application to small island Territories;

   (b) Heightening the awareness of options available to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories under General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) of 14 and 15 December 1960, respectively, concerning their future political status:

      (i) Emergence as a sovereign independent State;

      (ii) Free association with an independent State;

      (iii) Integration with an independent State;

   (c) Importance of dissemination of information to and from the Non-Self-Governing Territories on the process of self-determination.

2. Economic and social questions

(a) Economic and social development in the small Territories and their impact on the exercise of the right of the peoples of those Territories to self-determination;

(b) The problems of small, structurally open economies: heavy dependence on imports, a limited number of commodities and highly restricted internal markets;

(c) Food production: development of small-scale agricultural activities, and of fisheries;

(d) Development of tourism: its impact on the economic and social sectors, and on the environment;

(e) Addressing the issue of drug trafficking and money laundering;

(f) Development of financial management expertise and of skills necessary to negotiate and manage foreign investments; gaining access to adequate information systems;

(g) Development of industries and of indigenous technological capacities; and manufacturing for export;

(h) Human resources development and the consequences of emigration and immigration;

(i) The role of the specialized agencies, international organizations and regional organizations in the economic and social development of the Territories;

(j) Access of Non-Self-Governing Territories of the region to programmes and activities of the United Nations system with the aim of identifying areas in which technical and other assistance could be provided;

(k) Particular areas in which regional cooperation requires strengthening by both the Territories concerned and international agencies: preservation and protection of marine resources from over-exploitation; sea and air transport; disaster preparedness and relief; higher education; research and development; and regional pooling arrangements for sharing special skills and expertise;

(l) Enhancement of the role of women in the development of Non-self-Governing Territories;

(m) Access to information and expertise in the development of small-scale industries in small Territories.

3. Questions on environment and development

(a) Implications for the island Territories of issues pertaining to the environment and to development, such as global warming, sealevel rise, sustainable development and Agenda 21;

(b) Local efforts in national disaster preparedness: institutionalization and coordination of disaster relief; financing of public works projects; and training for disaster prevention;

(c) International and regional cooperation in order to mitigate the effects of natural disasters: provision of assistance and coordination of relief preparedness and prevention;

(d) Questions relating to the law of the sea and the Non-Self-Governing Territories of the region.

II. CONDUCT OF THE SEMINAR

A. Proceedings of the meetings

10. The Seminar was opened on 8 June by Mr. Renagi Renagi Lohia, Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations, in his capacity as Chairman of the Seminar. Mr. Lohia introduced the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea.

11. Mr. John R. Kaputin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, delivered an address at the opening of the Seminar. That statement, in accordance with a decision taken by the Seminar at its 6th meeting, on 10 June 1993, is reproduced in extenso in annex I to the present report.

12. A message received from the Government of the Solomon Islands was distributed to the participants.

13. A message received from the Secretary-General of the United Nations was read out by Mr. Wilfrid De Souza, Officer-in-Charge of the Division for Regional Cooperation and Self-Determination of the Department of Political Affairs.

14. At its final meeting, on 10 June 1993, the Seminar adopted by acclamation a final document entitled "Summary of Discussions". For further details, see chapter III of the present report. At the same meeting, a resolution of appreciation to the Government and people of Papua New Guinea was read out (see annex IV to the present report). Also, a message from The Right Honourable Paias Wingti was read out by Mr. Maimu Raka-Nou, Deputy Secretary (Operations), Department of Foreign Affairs and Ambassador of Papua New Guinea to the Federated States of Micronesia and Palau. That message, in accordance with a decision taken at that meeting, is reproduced in extenso in annex II to the present report. At the same meeting, a closing statement was made by the Chairman of the Special Committee.

15. In his statement following the address of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Lohia said that the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), had proclaimed that the subjection of people to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constituted a denial of fundamental human rights and affirmed that all peoples had the right to self-determination.

16. Since its inception, the Special Committee had been instrumental in bringing about the greatest political transition in human history. The decolonization of many nations had made possible the present international community of States, which made up the almost universal membership of the United Nations. Since the adoption of the Declaration in 1960, some 60 former colonial Territories had emerged from their colonial status, and over 85 million people had shed their dependent status.

17. Decolonization under United Nations guidance had entered the final phase of completion. The General Assembly had proclaimed the years 1990 to 2000 as the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism. Emphasis was being placed on acceleration of the decolonization process in order to usher in, in the twenty-first century, a world free from colonialism.

18. The Chairman stated that, in keeping with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), the people of a Non-Self-Governing Territory might decide to opt for independence, for a form of free association or for integration with an independent State.

19. The Committee believed that the international community should intensify its efforts to promote the economic and social progress of the dependent Territories. It recognized the importance of eliciting the views of the peoples of the Territories and that it had a leading role to play in those endeavours. One such way in which that could be achieved was by holding regional seminars to hear the views of the peoples of the region.

20. During the course of the regional seminars held in the Pacific and Caribbean regions, the Committee had become particularly sensitized to the fact that the process of decolonization had entered a new and complex phase, which demanded innovative approaches to challenges facing the remaining dependent Territories.

21. On the basis of information imparted at the Seminar, the Special Committee believed it would be in a better position to understand and respond to the needs of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific region.

22. The Committee was fully aware that some Territories had made remarkable progress towards self-reliance and enjoyed a high standard of living, while others continued to suffer handicaps arising from such factors as size, remoteness, vulnerability to natural disasters, the fragility of their ecosystems, heavy dependence on imports and a small number of commodities, weak indigenous technological capacities and a lack of skilled personnel. In order to alleviate those difficulties, the international community, together with the administering Powers, should continue to be involved in assisting with progress in development.

23. Over the years, the Committee had continued to reiterate the importance of on-the-spot information which could only be obtained by visiting missions to the Non-Self-Governing Territories. In that context, it continued to stress the importance of such missions to the dependent Territories and again renewed its call to administering Powers to invite the Special Committee to send such visiting missions to the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

B. Summary of statements by representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories

24. The ensuing section gives a summary of statements by representatives of American Samoa, Guam, New Caledonia and Tokelau, and by the representative of the Non-Self-Governing Territories from the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee.

American Samoa

25. Mr. Tauese Pita Sunia, Lieutenant-Governor of American Samoa, stated that American Samoans had their own Constitution which they reviewed every five years. They elected their Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, members of the House of Representatives and their Congressman to represent them in the United States Congress. The Judiciary were all local jurists appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and their Governor, with legislative endorsement. American Samoans were by all means self-governing. The United States Secretary of the Interior reviewed any changes in their Constitution and appointed their Chief Justice and Associate Justice. The federal share of the operating costs of their territorial Government was submitted under the budget of the Department of the Interior. American Samoans applied for the rest of their federal aid directly to each federal funding agency, just like any state of the United States. They spent their local funds as they pleased.

26. With regard to the economic status of the Territory, Mr. Sunia said that the Territory was economically stable, and that about 70 per cent of the workforce employed in the tuna canneries was imported labour, which gave an indication of the available job opportunities. A new garment manufacturer was starting operations with the promise of 800 new jobs. Financial problems (such as the territorial Government's deficit) were caused by mismanagement and was irrelevant to whom they affiliated with politically.

27. Mr. Sunia said that illiteracy did not exist in American Samoa and free compulsory education with free school transportation and free hot lunches and breakfast, free school books and equipment, with scholarships for on-island and overseas colleges made their educational system a beacon to many small independent nations. American Samoans had the most doctorate degrees per capita in the South Pacific. Their college students attending United States colleges and universities were all eligible for student financial aid just like any other United States students.

28. Mr. Sunia also said that in American Samoa there was free universal medical care - practically free hospitalization and totally free medication. Cases which required specialized treatment or the use of equipment not available in American Samoa were referred to Hawaii at the Government's expense.

29. Mr. Sunia indicated that probably most important to them was the preservation of their social systems. Their culture, which was the "fa'a samoa", or the "samoan way of life", which their ancestors had developed for them, was a unique social system that allowed them to live with each other on limited space with the least conflict.

30. On the question of land, Mr. Sunia said that true self-government could be achieved only if property was controlled. American Samoans owned and controlled their own land. The United States had kept its promise and protected their land. What little land had been bought by the United States Navy for its naval base had been turned over to their territorial Government when the Navy had left in 1950.

31. In conclusion, Mr. Sunia stated that American Samoa preferred to remain as a Territory of the United States. American Samoans had had political status commissions and plebiscites, and it was the clearly stated wish of the people that they remain American Samoans.

Guam

32. Ms. Lourdes T. Pangelinan and Mr. Leland Bettis, Representatives of the Guam Government, noted that Guam's colonial status was a sad truth that they hoped to change before the century drew to a close. They were eager to continue to work closely with the Special Committee, as they endeavoured to end their Territory's colonial status. Further, they noted that their direct participation represented a strong belief that international standards with respect to decolonization were inherently important and appropriate to Guam's proposal for developing its political status and ending its own colonial condition.

33. The representatives noted that the people of the Territory had proposed changes in their relationship with the administering Power. The process of decolonization, when begun, was without full knowledge and appreciation of the international conventions and customs that guided the decolonization process. As Guam gained an awareness of the international process, it became clear that their proposals fitted well within international conventions. The representatives cited in particular the areas of resource control, immigration, land use and self-determination, among others, where their proposal for status development mirrored international standards. They also noted that although there were differences between the activities of administering Powers, and differences in the particular circumstances affecting the status of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the problems associated with colonialism were universal in nature, and the solutions to those problems were universal in application. They said that continued and sharper focus on decolonization was vital for Guam because the process of decolonization had already taken too long. In that regard, they noted that Guam's recent political status proposal to the administering Power was the first real attempt fundamentally to change the island's political status, and that it was a proposal that had been driven exclusively by Guam.

34. In outlining Guam's proposal for political status change, Guam's representatives noted that, in its 1982 plebiscite, Guam had chosen to seek a new political relationship, that of commonwealth status. That new status would

also recognize the right of Guam's native people, the Chamorros, to determine the island's ultimate political future. They noted that, if passed, the draft Commonwealth Act would establish a process of Guam's decolonization through self-determination of the Chamorros. Given the impact of in-migration, they said it was necessary to define self-determination for Guam. To that end, they noted that it had been the Chamorros who had been colonized and that "it will be the Chamorro people who will be empowered to decolonize Guam".

35. They noted that the status of commonwealth was not an immediate proposal for outright independence for Guam, nor was it a petition for incorporation into the United States. Rather, it accomplished a measure of self-government for Guam by empowering the Government of the people of Guam with powers of internal self-government while establishing a framework for decolonization through self-determination of the Chamorro people.

36. The commonwealth status sought by Guam was not a final one. They noted that one day, Guam and its indigenous people would exercise that final determination. They said that in the future, if the administering Power desired, Guam might seek full incorporation into the administering Power as a state of their union, with full and equal rights. Or, if the administering Power was willing, Guam might seek some other form of association between sovereign States. Or, they noted, it was equally possible that one day the indigenous people of Guam would exercise their right to be fully independent. It was clearly stated, however, that the key was that Guam's ability to make a decision about its decolonized status would have to occur through an act of indigenous self-determination. The representatives noted that, until such time as that decision was made by the Chamorro people of Guam, the people of Guam should at least have a measure of internal self-government and control over their resources.

37. With regard to Guam's economic conditions, they noted that, economically, their island continued to prosper. Fuelled by the continued growth of the tourist sector and the construction industry, Guam's economic self-sufficiency had become a reality. Guam's economic development and economic stability would be further bolstered by the people of Guam's commonwealth proposal. In particular, the Guam proposal provided new opportunities for Guam in the areas of commerce, diversification of the economy and control over natural resources.

38. The representatives also noted that Guam's economic progress over the past decade had not been without an impact on the island's social environment. While tension underlay the economic progress (with crime of all types, traffic and related accidents, and a marked rise in Chamorro activism regarding Guam property held by the administering Power), advances were also noteworthy. Individual and household income had dramatically increased, as well as government revenues, during the period from 1982 to 1993. Additionally, over US$ 850 million in locally floated bonds had been let in the past four years for educational, infrastructure and airport improvements.

Tokelau

39. The Ulu-O-Tokelau (Mr. Salesio Lui) said that Tokelau must be given the freedom to arrive at an appropriate act of self-determination rather than achieving it by responding to an external set of criteria.

40. He said that since 1990, Tokelau had undergone major political changes, which are stated below:

(1) The Council of Faipule had been formed to provide ongoing government when the General Fono was not in session, and to appoint from the three faipule a titular head to be known as "Ulu-O-Tokelau";

(2) The General Fono had asked New Zealand to formalize the present informal delegation, a function currently exercised by the Administrator to the General Fono and the Council of Faipule;

(3) In recognition of the changes to the political institutions of Tokelau, and the increased responsibilities being placed on them, the General Fono had called for a review of the Tokelau public service in order to identify changes necessary to enable the service properly to support the new political institutions; and for the heads of departments to be located on Tokelau soil;

(4) As a result of the general elections held in January 1993, Tokelau had found itself with a new, younger team of political leaders, to assume new and increased responsibilities.

41. The Ulu-O-Tokelau said that the Council of Faipule's discussions with the Government of New Zealand in May 1993 had confirmed that it was necessary for Tokelau to take a step-by-step approach using the present form of the Council of Faipule, whose term of office is from 1993 to 1995, as a period of consolidation; the period was needed for the people of Tokelau to understand the process of engaging in the business of governing; the changes must be in accordance with the wishes of Tokelau; and it was Tokelau's wish that its relationship with the Government and people of New Zealand would continue.

42. The Ulu-O-Tokelau said that without the proper infrastructural support it would be difficult for Tokelau to exercise self-government to a great extent. Transport needed to be improved and a more efficient form of telecommunications was needed. Tokelau was also seeking to establish radio services in the near future.

43. The Ulu-O-Tokelau said that the limited resources available determined how Tokelau could shoulder the new responsibilities. There was much dependence on the annual grant-in-aid from New Zealand. The exclusive economic zone provided funds through the Pacific Islands/United States tuna treaty. Funds from extrabudgetary sources such as the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Health Organization and other United Nations and Commonwealth agencies were the second-highest sources of revenue.

44. He continued by stating that Tokelau needed protection of its greatest resource, the sea. The exclusive economic zone needed protection from pollution, since it was a major source of livelihood for the people. An environment of small low-lying islands such as Tokelau's was vulnerable to pollution and to natural disasters. Tokelau was concerned if global warming, changing weather patterns and sealevel rise were not naturally occurring phenomena but rather had been brought to Tokelau by man-made actions.

45. He said that the people of Tokelau looked forward to welcoming a United Nations mission to its shores in 1994.

New Caledonia

46. Mr. Paul Neaoutyine, President of the Front de libération nationale kanake socialiste, reaffirmed the extreme importance of General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 1541 (XV) and the Special Committee on decolonization for the Kanak people, the colonial people of New Caledonia.

47. For the Kanak people and minority groups, the continuing reaffirmation by the United Nations of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence meant the possibility of escaping from colonial domination, and hence the right to dignity, sovereignty and independence.

48. For the Kanak people, French colonialism had a long history, already marked by conflicts between the indigenous people and colonial settlers, and characterized by aspects which still constituted today's reality, such as the plundering of the land, the confinement of indigenous people on reservations, a special status for Kanaks and a religious education for Kanaks, among other things.

49. Jacobinism, or Parisian centralism, had been a constant factor in the statutory history of Kanaky. Following the traditional colonial statute applied from 1853 to 1946, the dozen or so overseas Territory statutes which had been applied thereafter conformed to the same principle and reserved the main powers for France; all had been adopted by the French Parliament.

50. There had been only four opportunities for an evolution towards decolonization. The first had appeared with the country's initial routine inclusion in the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, and had disappeared in 1946. The second had emerged with the Outline Law of 1956 and had vanished in 1963. The third had grown out of the Pisani statute, adopted in 1985, which provided for the holding of a referendum by 31 December 1987; that statute had been adopted as a result of a demonstration which had been organized by the Front de libération nationale kanake socialiste (FLNKS) on 11 November 1984 to call for a boycott of the Lemoine statute, and which had resulted in 15 deaths. Lastly, the fourth had arisen with the current statute, which had been obtained after the murder of some 20 people by the French army during a demonstration to protest the pro-French parody of a referendum organized by the Chirac-Pons Government in September 1987.

51. Those grave incidents had aroused democratic consciousness in France, leading to a change in the parliamentary majority and the opening of new negotiations in Paris. Those negotiations had culminated in the so-called Matignon-Oudinot Agreement and the adoption by referendum of an act establishing a new, transitional status for Kanaky, pending the holding of a referendum on self-determination in 1998. That act provided for the decentralization of local powers through the establishment of three provinces.

52. The referendum act set a general goal, over a 10-year period, of redistribution among the country's regions and population groups. Such redistribution should make it possible, through local development, for

population groups to have a voice, regardless of social and economic constraints. It provided for the sharing of wealth and the mobilization of productive investment for the development of the country's regions and islands.

53. During the medium-term assessment of the Agreement, held in Paris in February 1993, FLNKS had made it clear to the two other signatories that it deemed the degree of implementation of the redistribution programmes to be insufficient in all areas, including local economic development, education, training, health and social services and primary infrastructure.

54. In the view of FLNKS, five years after implementation of the Matignon-Oudinot Agreement there had been no significant improvement in the situation of the indigenous Kanak people, the principal victims of colonization in Kanaky, which would have indicated that any real decolonization was under way in the Territory. FLNKS had continued to participate in the process by calling for the opening of the talks on the 1998 referendum and the future of the country.

55. In signing the Agreement, the late President Tjibaou had assumed that following the Ouvéa massacre, France, which prided itself on being the birthplace of human rights, would ultimately recognize the right of the Kanak people to independence and thus move towards independence for them. That prospect was a long way from materializing.

56. The decolonization of Kanaky and of the Kanak people had a long history largely because France had always declined to accept United Nations principles and procedures and continued to consider their case as falling solely within the framework of the French Constitution. In 1946, France had withdrawn New Caledonia from the list of countries to be decolonized. In 1963, France had abrogated the Outline Law providing for self-determination and, following the Territory's reinclusion in the list in 1986, had refused to cooperate with the Special Committee on decolonization.

57. On behalf of FLNKS, Mr. Neaoutyine stated that the 1988 Agreement related only to the 10-year transitional status which was to bring about redistribution and prepare for a self-determination referendum, which had still not been discussed despite their requests. Moreover, the Rassemblement pour la Calédonie dans la République (RPCR) was already seeking to prolong the status quo of 25 years' standing to beyond the year 2000. It no longer seemed possible to prepare the country for independence on the basis of a common will, either with RPCR or the current French Government.

58. FLNKS also emphasized the danger posed by the flow of foreign migrants, which continued to make the Kanak people a minority in their own home. FLNKS had no control over the electoral corpus for 1998, in view of which it wished to obtain United Nations intervention in the referendum process. It needed anti-colonialist partners to assist the Territory in resolving the issues which had so far remained without a solution. Moreover, there was the question of the relative weakness of a people made a minority in their own home.

59. On behalf of FLNKS, Mr. Neaoutyine stated that the struggle for dignity and independence was an inalienable right of all peoples throughout the world and was not negotiable.

60. He reiterated that the objective of FLNKS remained that of full sovereignty and independence, and that since 1853 and 1958, in addition to their stolen freedom, the unkept promises were more than ever a deceit, an abuse and an insult to the progressive conscience of mankind.

Non-Self-Governing Territories of the Caribbean region

61. Mr. Carlyle Corbin, representative of the Caribbean Non-Self-Governing Territories, referred to perceived constitutional limitations which played a role in limiting the access of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to programmes and activities of the United Nations system, and from the international community as a whole.

62. He indicated that a successful decolonization process would be determined in large measure by the level of implementation by the United Nations of its own mandates in the field of decolonization.

63. One such mandate, he pointed out, was the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the United Nations system. He gave a brief background of the legislative authority for such participation emanating from resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, and of the Economic and Social Council.

64. In that connection, Mr. Corbin outlined a number of activities in furtherance of participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in the United Nations system that might be of interest to the Pacific region.

65. He pointed out that the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee (CDCC) had been involved in that issue on behalf of Caribbean Non-Self-Governing Territories since 1985 and had approved a number of resolutions from 1985 to 1992 on the question.

66. He made particular reference to a 1988 resolution creating the Working Group of Non-Independent Caribbean Countries and subsequent resolutions defining its mandate.

67. He also noted that part of that mandate was to begin consultations with Pacific non-independent countries to ensure that the activities of CDCC could benefit Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific region.

68. Mr. Corbin went on to outline a number of recommendations of the Seminar held in the Caribbean in 1992 which might be of interest to the participants of the Pacific Seminar, including collaboration between the Special Committee and the relevant regional institutions in the Caribbean and Pacific to request specialized agencies of the United Nations to increase participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories as associate members, and to initiate a dialogue with the governing councils of the United Nations bodies to facilitate that activity; actions by the United Nations technical organizations to examine ways of permitting the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in programmes, especially relating to the environment, assistance to small island developing countries, population and other areas; actions by the United Nations General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council providing for observer status in

its technical activities, as in the case of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, and observer status in the General Assembly.

69. Mr. Corbin also referred to other recommendations of the Caribbean seminar, including the establishment of an expert group of representatives of Pacific and Caribbean Non-Self-Governing Territories to advise the Secretary-General on ways to accomplish a successful decolonization process by the year 2000.

70. Regarding recent developments, the representative reported the approval in 1992 of a CDCC resolution calling for collaboration between the Working Group of Non-Independent Caribbean Countries and the Special Committee on decolonization to collaborate formally on those activities to benefit the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific and Caribbean.

71. He also noted successful efforts by the Working Group in obtaining observer status for the Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Pacific and Caribbean in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and the Global Conference on Sustainable Development of Island Developing Countries, and ongoing efforts with the International Conference on Population and Development.

III. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE SEMINAR

72. At its final meeting, on 10 June 1993, the participants in the Seminar adopted by acclamation the following Summary of Discussions:

Political development

1. Participants in the Seminar reaffirmed the importance of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 73 e concerning Non-Self-Governing Territories, as well as General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; and resolution 1541 (XV) of 15 December 1960 containing the principles which should guide Members of the United Nations in determining whether or not a Non-Self-Governing Territory can be said to have reached a full measure of self-government by: (a) emergence as a sovereign independent State; (b) free association with an independent State; or (c) integration with an independent State.

2. Participants praised the United Nations, in particular the Special Committee, for the role they had played in the decolonization process during the past 33 years. They expressed continued support for the Declaration and the need for its implementation in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories.

3. They noted with appreciation the opening address by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea, and supported his position that the objectives of the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism should not be viewed in isolation from the recognition that the interests of the inhabitants of the Non-Self-Governing Territories are paramount and that the administering Powers are required not only to advance those interests but to promote them to the utmost. Participants noted the proposal initiated by Papua New Guinea at the United Nations to increase opportunities and participation for developing countries, with particular reference to their economies.

4. Participants reaffirmed that the question of territorial size, geographical isolation and limited resources should not constitute an obstacle to the exercise by the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories of their right to self-determination.

Where General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) had not been fully implemented, the international community should continue to bear responsibility for the Territories until the peoples concerned had an opportunity to exercise freely their right to self-determination.

5. Some participants considered that sovereignty resides in the people of some of the Non-Self-Governing Territories and their duly constituted Governments.

6. Participants called upon the Special Committee to continue to review the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories to which the Declaration on decolonization applies.

7. Some participants stated that the indigenous people of some Non-Self-Governing Territories have the right to self-determination and may, therefore, choose independence or self-government in free association with any nation or organization of nations.

8. Participants were generally of the view that in the decolonization process there is no alternative to the principle of self-determination. All options consistent with resolution 1541 (XV) should therefore be considered legitimate as long as it can be ascertained that they are the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

9. The Seminar discussed at length the question of free association with an independent State, one of the three options identified in General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV), as many participants considered that it may be of special interest to the small island Territories.

10. It was suggested that the question of free association should be studied further. Some participants suggested that there was scope, within United Nations norms on decolonization, for developing, as another option for some very small Non-Self-Governing island Territories, a political status combining aspects of both integration with an independent State and free association with an independent State. It was suggested that this option could involve a supportive constitutional relationship with the former administering authority or another independent State in the region; could permit the island Territory to exercise autonomy to the full extent its people's desire, including the exploitation of its exclusive economic zone and the right to be a member of relevant international organizations; could commit the partner State to providing ongoing economic and other assistance, in conjunction with other States and international organizations; and could be safeguarded not only by a contractual relationship with the island Territory but also by a treaty obligation to the international community. The status should be freely chosen by an act of self-determination, with the right to change the status by a further act of self-determination at a future date.

11. Representatives of some Non-Self-Governing Territories expressed concern that proposals for new models in decolonization should comply with the principles contained in General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV).

12. Some participants stated that free association should take the form of a revocable compact, unilaterally terminable by either party.

13. Participants considered that the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories have the right to formulate, amend and adopt their own constitutions.

14. Some representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and some participants suggested that, in conformity with the inscription of New Caledonia on the list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Special Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it call upon France to adhere to United Nations principles in organizing the referendum on self-determination scheduled for 1998. They further recommended that France should take the necessary steps to ensure that the different options to be placed on the ballot, including the option of independence, will be clearly defined in order to inform the populations concerned.

15. Some representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and some participants also suggested that the Special Committee should recommend to the General Assembly to caution France that until a genuine act of self-determination has been held in New Caledonia, its immigration policy should not exacerbate the minority position in which the Kanaks find themselves. In the light of the electoral body agreed upon for the referendum in 1998, special attention should be given to compiling the list of voters.

16. Some representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and participants called upon administering Powers to recognize international standards with respect to the in-migration of settlers and other migrants into Non-Self-Governing Territories, as such migration contributes to demographic disruption and threatens the genuine exercise of self-determination.

17. Some representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and participants called for the recognition by administering Powers of the inherent right of the indigenous peoples of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories to exercise self-determination in view of the future political status of their homelands.

18. Representatives of some Non-Self-Governing Territories and other participants called upon administering Powers to recognize native title to property confiscated under colonial laws and systems and to expedite the process of return of such property to their rightful owners.

19. Some representatives of some Non-Self-Governing Territories noted with concern attempts by administering Powers to limit the participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in regional and international organizations.

20. Some representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories proposed that provisions be implemented for representatives of elected Governments of Non-Self-Governing Territories to participate in the meetings of the Special

Committee and its subcommittees or other appropriate organs of the United Nations during consideration of their respective Territories in the field of decolonization.

21. Some participants called for the establishment of an expert group comprised of representatives of the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, to represent the interests and articulate the needs of their Territories and, to that end, to advise the Committee and the Secretary-General on mechanisms for a successful completion to the decolonization process.

22. Participants called upon the Special Committee to intensify its dissemination of information on decolonization directly to the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, with a view to raising awareness among the peoples of the applicability of international principles to the self-determination process. They recommended that the Territories themselves should also provide up-to-date information to the Committee in time for the preparation of its working papers.

23. Some participants, including representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories, called upon the Special Committee to concentrate its efforts on the particular problems of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, which differ in many respects from previous colonial situations.

24. Participants considered that the Special Committee should re-examine the nature of the information it disseminates to Non-Self-Governing Territories concerning self-determination and that the United Nations has a unique opportunity and responsibility to bring together the most advanced solutions for converting national separation into global unity. To this end, they called for creative solutions to replace traditional practices and outdated resolutions.

25. Representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and participants called for greater measures of cooperation with the Special Committee by administering Powers.

26. Participants considered that the Special Committee could help to develop a core group of leaders and role models to encourage young people to attain new heights of political, economic and social development. In this context, they considered that video materials should be used more widely in teaching, especially in island States with literacy and language barriers.

27. Participants called upon the Special Committee to request the General Assembly to invite the Secretary-General to prepare a status report on the implementation of its resolutions on decolonization.

28. Some participants noted that for many very small Non-Self-Governing island Territories, the real enemy was the fear of future neglect. They considered that the Special Committee should focus not only on how soon their colonial status can be terminated but on how they can be assured that they will have the right to maintain their own special identity and at the same time receive the continuing economic and other assistance on which their well-being depends.

29. Participants recognized that there may be Non-Self-Governing Territories which are content with the current relationship with their administering Powers, and at present wish no change in their political status.

30. In this regard, some participants urged the Special Committee not to emphasize that all Non-Self-Governing Territories should conduct an act of self-determination by the year 2000 in order that they may continue to keep open their options on future political status. They urged the continuation of the Special Committee on decolonization after the year 2000, in order to provide international oversight for those Non-Self-Governing Territories which do not wish to make a definitive decision on their future political status before that date.

Economic and social development

31. Participants expressed the view that the administering Powers, in cooperation with the territorial Governments and the specialized agencies of the United Nations, should take the necessary measures to ensure sustained and balanced development of the economies of the Non-Self-Governing Territories, based on the needs and plans of those Territories. Participants noted that economic development in many Non-Self-Governing Territories was hindered by factors such as their relatively small size, limited internal markets, lack of natural resources, vulnerability to natural disasters and heavy dependence on imports. They recommended that in Territories whose economies were mainly based on one industry, serious attempts should be made at diversification. Sectors such as fishing and agriculture should be developed and educational awareness campaigns should be conducted to sensitize the peoples of the Territories to the negative effects of too much reliance on imported food.

32. Some participants urged the Special Committee to seek formal collaboration with relevant regional groups, with the goal of increasing participation of Non-Self-Governing Territories in programmes and activities of the different organs of the United Nations system.

33. Some participants called upon the Special Committee to request the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly to include provisions in their resolutions for elected Governments and/or authorities to participate in technical meetings in an observer capacity.

34. Participants called for the provision of observer status for Non-Self-Governing Territories, either individually or as a group in the General Assembly, as well as in other bodies of the United Nations system.

35. Participants called upon administering Powers to recognize the right of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories to complete jurisdiction over the disposition of the land and ocean-based resources in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

36. Given their small economies, many participants recognized that it was extremely difficult for the Non-Self-Governing Territories to achieve economies of scale similar to those of larger countries. In this connection, some participants suggested that the General Assembly should be encouraged to invite the administering Powers to facilitate the promotion of trading relationships

between the Non-Self-Governing Territories and the neighbouring countries and States of the region.

37. Participants noted that, given their attractive climate and environmental conditions, the tourism industry had become an important economic activity in some Non-Self-Governing Territories. While recognizing that tourism could be a major source of revenue for those Territories owing to their limited natural resources, participants considered that in the development of that industry, account should be taken of the need to ensure that scarce land resources were not alienated from the people of the Territories and that the expansion of the tourist facilities should be carefully monitored to avoid cultural disruption and marginalization of the local population.

38. Participants took note of the vulnerability of the Territories to illicit activities, such as drug trafficking, money laundering and other forms of crime and, in this connection, called upon the administering Powers concerned and the international community to take all necessary measures in cooperation with the territorial Governments to combat those problems.

39. Participants emphasized the need to provide the populations of the Non-Self-Governing Territories with the necessary educational and technical skills for public administration. Some noted, however, the problem of the "brain-drain" which affects a number of the Territories. It was also pointed out that Territories with relatively high standards of living attracted large numbers of immigrants with resultant effects on, among other matters, the ownership of economic interests. This combination of in-and-out migration patterns has seriously affected the demographic composition of some populations, which, in turn, could have a substantial impact on the expression of popular desires with respect to self-determination.

40. Participants expressed the need to develop industrial linkages with rural economies, thereby improving income distribution and reducing rural-urban migration.

41. Participants believed that regional organizations should assist Non-Self-Governing Territories in increasing their access to markets and should institute measures to enable Non-Self-Governing Territories to benefit fully from existing preferential trade arrangements.

42. Participants also believed that international organizations should assist Non-Self-Governing Territories in upgrading their indigenous technological infrastructures and in promoting successful local technologies.

43. Participants recalled that regional organizations could assist in developing a regional programme of cooperation in the management of regional economic exclusive zones, which aims, inter alia, at protecting marine resources from illegal exploitation, delimiting maritime boundaries and reviewing fisheries legislation. They expressed the hope that those Non-Self-Governing Territories in the region which hold observer status in the South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency would benefit from the programme and that other Territories would be encouraged to participate in it.

44. Participants considered that advanced information technologies could be used as a catalyst for economic development and that heightening awareness of options will require networking and major investment in advanced technology and training.

45. Participants considered that the United Nations, in cooperation with the administering Powers, should place more emphasis on methods of teaching self-sufficiency and should avail itself of satellite technology for trans-regional networks to enhance education, trade, government, ethics and exchanges of ideas. Participants also noted that teleconferencing could reduce travel expenditures.

46. Participants also pointed out the importance of drawing up territorial development plans and the need for capital projects to conform to that plan.

47. Participants recommended that the Special Committee should urge regional organizations such as the South Pacific Forum to provide special opportunities in their programmes, activities and conventions for the full and meaningful participation of the Non-Self-Governing Territories of the region.

48. Participants requested the Special Committee to urge the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, the United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to make special efforts to provide assistance to enable non-governmental organizations from the region to participate in regional meetings and programmes.

49. Participants recommended that the Special Committee should request UNDP, the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Bank to make accessible appropriate resources and expertise to the Non-Self-Governing Territories or to the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme in order to enable them to participate in regional organizations.

50. Some participants stated that the decolonization process should recognize and facilitate the contribution that public/private sector cooperation can make to developing economic self-determination; one example is ecotourism and business training and development that facilitates indigenous peoples' participation in it.

Environment and development

51. Regarding protection of the environment, participants suggested that national parks should be created in areas particularly vulnerable to environmental damage, and information programmes should be launched to educate the local population as well as tourists on the need to safeguard the environment.

52. With regard to environmental issues such as global warming, participants noted with alarm that rising sealevels could have potentially disastrous effects on some Non-Self-Governing Territories since even a relatively small rise of the ocean level could cause extensive damage to waterfront-based industries and public facilities and ultimately even threaten the Territory's existence. In this connection, participants called for the

observation by all States of the decisions reached at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in June 1992 at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, concerning the need to preserve and protect the environment while permitting sustainable development to take place.

53. Participants also noted the vulnerability of many Non-Self-Governing Territories to natural disasters and stressed the need for them to be included in the programmes and projects of the United Nations system, including those of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction.

54. Participants noted that Non-Self-Governing Territories may wish to benefit from those environmental protection and sustainable development guidelines, and standards and criteria being developed in neighbouring States.

55. Participants urged the Special Committee to request the administering Powers of the remaining Territories to make accessible appropriate resources and expertise in their Territories, to enable them to initiate biodiversity conservation programmes of their own and/or to participate in other regional environmental programmes.

56. Participants considered that the Special Committee should urge the administering Powers to provide legal and political opportunities for their Territories to participate fully in regional conventions and programmes that relate to their environment and future livelihood.

Annex I

STATEMENT BY MR. JOHN R. KAPUTIN CMG MP, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA

I am pleased and proud to have been asked to deliver the opening address to this important seminar on conditions in the small island Non-Self-Governing Territories in the South Pacific.

On behalf of the Government and people of Papua New Guinea, I welcome participants from overseas to our country.

I also take pleasure in welcoming home the Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization and of this seminar, my fellow countryman, Papua New Guinea's Permanent Representative at the United Nations.

The United Nations and decolonization

Papua New Guinea is a particularly apt - even unique - location for a United Nations-sponsored seminar on decolonization.

It is, after all, one of very few countries to have had a close relationship before independence with both of the principal organs of the United Nations concerned with dependent territories and decolonization: the Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee of 24.

I cannot help noting that Papua New Guinea also features in a striking, symmetrical - and, I think, unique - historical sequence, in which the "Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories", embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, was followed after 15 years by the United Nations General Assembly's Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and then followed, in turn, 15 years after, by Papua New Guinea's independence.

And 15 years after Papua New Guinea's independence, the international decade specifically dedicated by the United Nations to the final eradication of colonialism was ushered in.

Mr. Chairman,

Papua New Guinea has, in fact, had an even closer and longer association with international efforts to secure the rights of colonial countries and peoples than the preceding sequence suggests.

Part of the country was, after all, brought under the mandates system which was set up by the League of Nations at the end of the First World War.

The former Territory of New Guinea was then frequently discussed by members of the Permanent Mandates Commission between the wars.

Following the establishment of the United Nations in the aftermath of the Second World War, a series of visiting missions from the Trusteeship Council toured what was then the territory of New Guinea at intervals of three years.

Their reports, as well as reports from the Administering Authority and the Australian Government, were regularly discussed by the Trusteeship Council.

It was, in fact, in my electorate, Rabaul, that the first request for independence made by a Papua New Guinean leader was received by one of these missions during the early 1960s.

It was also in response to a report prepared by the World Bank at the suggestion of a United Nations visiting mission that I made my first major political speech criticizing Australian policy for Papua New Guinea.

Towards the end of Australian rule, a mission made up of members of the Trusteeship Council as well as the Special Committee of 24 toured the entire country.

Since Papua New Guinea became independent in 1975, successive Governments have helped to maintain the sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity of Vanuatu in 1980; participated in events associated with termination of the United Nations Trusteeship in parts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and pressed - with eventual success in 1985 - for reinscription of New Caledonia on the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Papua New Guinea's representatives at the United Nations in New York have been active - and enthusiastic - participants in the work of the Special Committee of 24. They have also tried to be of assistance to representatives of the Kanak Socialist National Liberation Front, the FLNKS, in New York. But, like other Governments which support the target of eradicating colonialism by the end of the decade, the Government of Papua New Guinea looks forward to a time when the Special Committee's purposes will have been achieved.

The United Nations concern with the rights of the people of dependent Territories is firmly founded in the Charter of the United Nations. Thus, Articles 1 and 55 refer to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of people; Articles 73 and 74 contain the declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories; and Articles 75 to 91 provide for the Trusteeship System.

But the widest and most specific commitments are contained in Article 73.

Although that Article refers specifically to Members "which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government", the principles it embodies clearly apply to all Members of the United Nations. These principles include recognition that "the interests of the inhabitants of these Territories are paramount", and that promotion of their well-being to the utmost is a "sacred trust".

Note the strength, directness and clarity of the language: the interests of the inhabitants of dependent Territories are described as being not simply important but "paramount".

The Administering Powers are required not only to advance these interests but to promote them "to the utmost". Furthering the well-being of the inhabitants of dependent Territories is not just a commitment or even a binding obligation but "a sacred trust".

Note also the recognition that dependency status will, inevitably, come to an end, which is subtly implied in the description of dependent Territories as being not merely "Non-Self-Governing" but as "not yet" having attained self-government - I emphasize "not yet".

The degree of self-government to which dependent Territories are headed is, moreover, stated to be "a full measure".

The objectives embodied in Article 73 are pertinent not only to the circumstances of the remaining dependent Territories but to the Governments of independent countries.

Part of the new world order which produced the United Nations - and which the United Nations was, in turn, intended to strengthen - following the Second World War, these objectives are just as relevant to the new world order emerging from the end of the cold war - in spirit and aspiration, if not always in the precise words used.

Thus, the objectives specified in Article 73 include:

"(a) To ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

"(b) To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances ... and ... varying stages of advancement;

"(c) To further international peace and security;

"(d) To promote constructive measures of development ...".

It is surely no accident that, when the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was promoted in 1960, its sponsors were willing to refer specifically in the opening paragraph of the preamble to the principles stated in the Charter.

By then, the composition of the United Nations had begun to change as an increasing number of newly independent States sought - and received - admittance, perhaps even faster than the framers of Article 73 had foreseen. Membership of the United Nations had, in fact, become an almost unvarying accompaniment - and symbol - of independence. Changes in the membership of the United Nations had also led to changes in the General Assembly's objectives. The strength - and urgency - of the majority's determination to bring colonialism to a complete and early end had increased dramatically as a result.

Thus, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples states - without qualification - that:

> "... all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory".

It also proclaims:

> "... the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

Like the Charter, the Declaration recognizes - and commits the United Nations to support for - the right of self-determination. It is, moreover, quite explicit in affirming that the right should be exercised by nations, and that independence should be the outcome.

Thus, the Declaration states that:

> "Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence."

It also says that:

> "Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with ... the Charter".

The strong sense of urgency which Members of the United Nations now feel about decolonization is emphasized in the way in which the Declaration denounces "pretexts" - without conceding that there might be reasons - for delay.

Members' determination to give effect to the Declaration was displayed in the agreement in 1961 to establish a special committee for the purpose, and in the decision reached one year later to expand the Special Committee's membership from 17 to 24.

The United Nations flexibility and realism concerning what has, in practice, been possible in particular cases is evident in the patience which Members have continued to display towards the remaining dependent Territories, and in their willingness to accept that self-determination need not always be followed by independence.

Nowhere has that patience and willingness been more clearly evident than in the South Pacific.

Thus, more than 70 years after the League of Nations was established, almost 50 years after the Charter of the United Nations was concluded, and 30 years after the Declaration that colonial countries and peoples should be granted independence without delay, we find ourselves in a decade dedicated to the eradication of colonialism - and attending a seminar concerned with the remaining dependencies in the South Pacific.

The dependencies which are listed for consideration by the Special Committee include the French Territory of New Caledonia (known to many of its indigenous inhabitants, the Kanaks, as "Kanaky"); the New Zealand Territory of Tokelau; the United Kingdom's Territory of Pitcairn; and the United States of America's territories of American Samoa, Guam and the remaining part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Palau.

When one looks at the populations and areas involved, it is clear that the Special Committee's objective of eradicating colonialism from the South Pacific is within reach - though the continuing reluctance of certain colonial Powers, in particular, adds an element of uncertainty.

Meanwhile, even in countries which have been independent for quite some time, significant vestiges of colonialism remain. Governments and private citizens are still forced to grapple with obstacles to development left to them by their former colonial rulers.

As one who has had the privileges of being among the leaders of a movement that struggled for Papua New Guinea to become independent, of serving on the Pre-independence Constitutional Planning Committee, and now of pursuing decolonization as Minister for Foreign Affairs, I share the frustrations of those who feel that colonialism should have been completely eliminated long before the current international decade dedicated to its eradication. (If I may be permitted to make a purely personal observation, then I should like to add that I am surprised - and dismayed - that colonialism has been allowed to last for so long.)

I am no less frustrated to see how the legacy of colonialism continues to hinder development in countries which, like Papua New Guinea, have become independent during the lifetime of the United Nations.

Colonialism and decolonization

Colonialism has a much longer history than formal colonial rule. Colonial attitudes, behaviour and even institutions were quite widespread well before the major nineteenth- and twentieth-century European empires were established. They have often managed to outlast them.

Thus, decolonization ought, in many respects, to be regarded as an objective rather than an achievement - not only in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories but even in independent countries.

In the South Pacific, colonialism has taken almost every known form - from informal sphere of influence to formal empire, from colony through condominium, protectorate and protected State to United Nations Trusteeship, and from direct to indirect rule. In certain cases, metropolitan Governments have employed legal fictions - such as the claim that the French Territories are part of France - in order to try to disguise and deny the realities of colonialism in fact.

Just as colonialism has taken various forms, so decolonization in the South Pacific has proceeded at various rates - and towards various outcomes. Thus, Western Samoa became independent in 1962, followed by Nauru in 1968, Fiji in

1970, Papua New Guinea in 1975, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu in 1978, Kiribati in 1979 and Vanuatu in 1980. The Kingdom of Tonga, which was never really colonized, regained its independence in 1970.

Other former colonial dependencies have entered into various forms of free association with former colonial Powers - with New Zealand in the case of Cook Islands and Niue, and with the United States of America in the case of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas - and, somewhat more ambiguously, in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Marshall Islands.

Norfolk Island, which was once regarded as, in effect, an external territory, has been made part of Australia - without a proper act of self-determination or explicit agreement by the United Nations.

New Caledonia has, as I have already observed, been re-inscribed on the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, from which it had previously been removed. The complexity of the situation of New Caledonia, where the original inhabitants, the Kanaks, are only the largest of a number of different ethnic minorities, seems especially poignant during the current International Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples.

Overall, then, the process of eradicating colonialism from the South Pacific has been slow. Progress has been uneven. Where decolonization has taken place, outcomes have varied quite widely. The last vestiges of colonialism have yet to be completely eliminated from the South Pacific. Moreover, the legacy of colonialism continues to influence developments - or, rather, to slow development - even in independent and freely associated States.

But partly in spite - and partly because - of its persistence, colonialism has an unusual feature: it tends to be self-destructive. The oppressive structures and practices which are integral to colonialism - and on which colonialism relies for its own survival - help to stimulate public awareness of justice, rights and obligations which have been denied. Colonialism often gives rise to its own most vehement opponents. My own and others' experiences of colonialism - as well as our involvement in decolonization - in Papua New Guinea are cases in point.

Colonialism and decolonization in Papua New Guinea

Papua New Guinea entered what might be described as the final stages of Australian rule at about the same time as the General Assembly of the United Nations agreed to the text of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Somewhat ironically, the Australian Government claimed to be preparing the people of Papua New Guinea to determine our future at a time in the future which seemed so far distant as to be indeterminate.

What Australian officials failed to appreciate was that Papua New Guineans were often being quite literally "prepared", but not necessarily in the manner or towards the objectives which the Australian Government intended. What we were learning was not what most Australian officials were trying to teach.

Like people in other colonial situations, our experiences under German and British, Japanese and then Australian rule were leading us towards our own -

independent - conclusions. For an increasing number of Papua New Guineans, a word which Australian Ministers responsible for Papua New Guinea would not allow to pass their lips until 1968 enabled us not only to exercise our own judgements but to identify our goal: independence.

The part of the country where I was born, which I represent in the National Parliament, and which I call home, is among the most fertile places for agriculture in Papua New Guinea. Significant areas of my own and nearby electorates have been covered by foreign-owned plantations for more than 100 years. Those plantations are on land traditionally owned by Tolai people. Much of that land was taken by force, or bought at prices which can only be described as exploitative. The development of that land for commercial agriculture has required the cooperation, or at least the acquiescence - and labour - of Tolai and other people.

But even as the winds of change began to blow through other dependent Territories during the 1960s, ownership and management of all forms of economic activity on the Gazelle Peninsula - and, indeed, throughout Papua New Guinea - remained almost entirely in foreign hands.

When the Australian Government tried to place the only commercial and government bodies which were truly controlled by Tolai people - a cocoa cooperative and local government councils - under multiracial control, it was surprised to discover what ordinary people had learned: that education and economic activity are important keys to power - and that their relative absence among Tolais was a very good reason for resisting the Government's plans.

Almost inevitably, a situation as complex as that on the Gazelle Peninsula during the middle and late 1960s gave rise to divisions between different ethnic groups - and even among the traditional Tolai inhabitants - there. Among the Tolais, the main division was between people who believed that they were benefiting from the status quo; people who wanted as little as possible to do with the prevailing colonial order; and people, including myself and other members of the Mataungan association, who wanted to bring about change. Similar differences arose among people in other parts of Papua New Guinea, particularly in areas such as central and southern Bougainville Island, where the negative effects of foreign-sponsored, foreign-owned and foreign-controlled development were most intensely felt.

As in other colonial situations, those differences concerned both objectives and tactics.

The then leader of the Australian Federal Parliamentary Opposition, E. G. Whitlam, was almost alone among Australian political leaders and observers in concluding that the Australian Government would not be able to unite the people of Papua New Guinea behind its policies for Papua New Guinea but that it might accidentally unite them in confrontation.

If I may put the matter quite crudely: the manifold - and manifest - indignities, inequities and injustices which are characteristic of colonialism are unlikely to stimulate support for the status quo among people who are disadvantaged or oppressed. They might, however, stimulate opposition.

It is, moreover, entirely beside the point whether or not colonialists recognize what they are or what they are doing - and whether they try to conceal the truth from themselves or others by using other terms, or by describing a colony as part of a country whose other elements lie thousands of kilometres away. It may even be irrelevant in Territories where the authorities proclaim - and practise - what has been called in another context "welfare state colonialism".

Thus, the contradictions between what the people of Papua New Guinea were being taught and what members of the Mataungan association and like-minded groups were actually learning gave rise to a situation in which independent thinking provided a basis for independent action. Written and oral protests, demonstrations and even a certain amount of violence, prompted by frustration at continuing government inaction, followed. Intellectual independence paved the way for constitutional independence.

But with the inevitable passage of time, political leadership in Papua New Guinea often gave way, as it has done elsewhere, to aspirations for government. Then, government itself gave way to a widespread preoccupation with management.

A combination of people who had learned - all too well - what colonial Governments had tried to teach - and people too young or otherwise unaffected to have learned the bitter - and often personal - lessons of colonialism, came to office, if not to power.

Shortcomings in their political understanding and will then meant that many of the inequities characteristic of colonialism have remained largely unchanged, and even unattended. Thus, the economic changes to which all citizens, including government at all levels, are committed in the opening part of Papua New Guinea's National Constitution are national goals in name rather than practice. The need - and struggle - to overcome values, practices and institutions which have been inherited, imposed or imported from abroad, without proper regard for local conditions, continue.

Decolonization does not - and cannot - conclude at independence. It is, in fact, precisely because I believe that the aspirations of most citizens can be realized only through an ongoing process of decolonization that I have deliberately chosen to give priority to increasing opportunity and participation as Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The need for increased opportunity and participation, especially for citizens of developing countries, is quite readily apparent to even the most casual observer.

The struggle, though peaceful, is difficult, though clearly urgent. But the risk - and the price - of failure are no less great for the Government and people of Papua New Guinea- or of other developing countries - than they were before. In a world where competition for capital is becoming ever more intense, they are, in fact, generally greater.

When I had the honour of serving as a member of the Pre-independence Constitutional Planning Committee, my colleagues and I regarded our task as

involving more than the mere replacement of Australians by Papua New Guineans. We knew from experience, shared with our people - if not from what Australian officials were telling us - that more was required: increased - and increasing - opportunities for participation, in all aspects of social, political and, especially, economic life by our people.

That is why both opportunity and participation are mentioned specifically in the national goals and directive principles at the beginning of Papua New Guinea's National Constitution. It is also why they run through the substantive provisions and institutional arrangements - from human rights and obligations, through citizenship and provincial government, to the rules established for the exercise of, and relations between, legislative, executive and judicial power.

It is, obviously, why my motto - and goal - as Minister for Foreign Affairs are opportunity and participation.

Opportunity and participation

Increasing opportunity and participation is, as I have already suggested, a personal, a government and a national goal. It is also a goal which is widely shared by people and Governments in other developing countries.

Changes occurring before, at and since the end of the cold war suggest that opportunity and participation are becoming increasingly important to people and Governments in even more countries - and to international organizations.

Opportunity and participation is, therefore, the theme of an initiative which I have proposed, on behalf of the Government, at the United Nations.

Support has been sought - and received - from a growing number of Governments and international organizations, including members of the two most comprehensive organizations of - and for - developing countries: the Group of 77 and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Department of Foreign Affairs, including yourself, Mr. Chairman, has been active in the cause.

The detailed proposal, as it has evolved so far, is for the United Nations to appoint a small panel of distinguished, expert and experienced persons to submit a detailed report to the Secretary-General on practical options for increasing opportunity and participation, with particular reference to the economies of developing countries. The report is to be finalized in time for debate during the fiftieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1995. It will, I hope, be the economic counterpart for developing countries of the United Nations Secretary-General's "Agenda for Peace".

The process of compiling the report ought, at the very least, to serve as a focal point for a world-wide information exchange: what I have described elsewhere as "a practical opportunity for participation in collective problem solving".

I shall ask the organizers of this seminar to be kind enough to distribute printed outlines of the proposal to all participants for their information.

I look forward to receiving - and learning from - as wide as possible a range of constructive responses.

Conclusion

Demands for opportunity and participation have been among the principal causes, catalysts and calls for decolonization. They have also been important sources of other forms of discontent with prevailing social, political and economic orders, including threats of lawlessness and disorder. They encapsulate what might be described as the unfinished part of decolonization. They set an agenda for ongoing change which is likely to be both relevant - and widely welcomed - long after the Special Committee on Decolonization has completed its current task.

Colonialism might not be listed as a major issue in the "Agenda for Peace". But its lingering effects - and the need for an ongoing process of decolonization - deserve not only urgent attention but prompt and decisive action.

Whether or not the Special Committee should have its mission extended to deal with some of the issues I have identified in this address - or whether other bodies should be given the charge - is a matter for Members of the United Nations to determine. Suffice it for me to say at this stage that opportunity and participation are likely to remain relevant and important issues and goals, especially - but not only - to people and Governments in developing countries, long after the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism is over, and the goals to which it is dedicated have been achieved.

Let me therefore conclude by saying, then, that the Government of Papua New Guinea is committed not only to the global principles of the United Nations but to their local and regional application.

As a founding member - in good standing - of the Melanesian Spearhead Group, we continue to endorse the agreed principles of cooperation among independent States in Melanesia, which include:

Respect for, and promotion of, independence as the inalienable right of colonial countries and peoples.

We are pleased that our friends from the FLNKS, who recently received me with traditional Pacific - and specifically Melanesian - hospitality in their country, are admitted as full participants in Spearhead meetings. I am honoured to see then again in Port Moresby among the distinguished guests who have been invited to take part in this important South Pacific regional seminar on conditions in the small island Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Let me repeat, on behalf of the Government and people of Papua New Guinea, a very warm welcome to the seminar's organizers and members.

Annex II

MESSAGE FROM THE RIGHT HONOURABLE PAIAS WINGTI,
PRIME MINISTER OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA

On behalf of the Government and the people of Papua New Guinea, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the United Nations Special Committee of 24 for the contributions that you, as well as the other distinguished participants in your important seminar, have made to the wider dissemination of information about, and your analyses of, the political, economic and social conditions in the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories.

Although I have, unfortunately, been unable to attend your deliberations in person, I have followed them closely, with great personal interest, through the briefings provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Papua New Guinea has had a long and close relationship with the United Nations, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. John R. Kaputin, told the Seminar in his opening statement, from the time that the country was still a dependent Territory, and since becoming a member of the United Nations at independence in 1975.

The people and Government of my country appreciate the contribution that the United Nations has made to Papua New Guinea's welfare and development. We are, as the country's official name implies, intensely proud of belonging to an "independent State".

We acknowledge the very great honour that the international community has paid us in electing our Permanent Representative at the United Nations as the Chairman of the Special Committee of 24 and in holding this Seminar in our national capital, Port Moresby.

As befits Papua New Guinea's status as a country which has become independent during the lifetime, and as a Member committed to the principles, of the United Nations, my Government strongly supports United Nations efforts to eradicate the last vestiges of colonialism by the year 2000. Working with our colleagues in the Melanesian Spearhead Group and the South Pacific Forum, we have a particular commitment to the decolonization of New Caledonia, with special safeguards for our Melanesian Wantoks, the Kanaks.

My Government is particularly concerned that the progress being made under the Matignon Accords should not be derailed - a point which is of particular significance in this, the International Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples. We are also committed to seeing that the process of self-determination throughout the entire South Pacific region continues, with sensitivity to the circumstances and aspirations of the various peoples involved.

As the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, has observed in his message to the Seminar, "While much has been accomplished, all has not yet been completed" in bringing colonialism to an end, either in our immediate region, the South Pacific, or elsewhere.

I look forward to reading the Summary of Discussions and to witnessing the realization of the valuable, practical recommendations I am sure you will make.

Let me conclude by expressing the Government's sincere appreciation of the contribution the Seminar has made to public understanding in our region of the work that the United Nations is carrying out in relation to decolonization, and to that work itself. We thank all participants in the Seminar for their contributions, and our friends from abroad for finding the time to visit Papua New Guinea.

I wish our visitors, in particular, a safe journey home, and look forward to welcoming you to Papua New Guinea again.

Annex III

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. PARTICIPATING MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Chairman of the Special Committee	H.E. Mr. Renagi Renagi Lohia Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations

Members of the Special Committee

Chile	Mr. José Manuel Ovalle Minister Counsellor Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Czech Republic	Mr. Alexander Slabý Counsellor Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Fiji	H.E. Ratu Manasa K. Seniloli Permanent Representative to the United Nations
Grenada	H.E. Mr. Eugene M. Pursoo Permanent Representative to the United Nations
Indonesia	Mr. Hadi Wayarabi Director for International Organization Affairs Department of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Rezlan Ishar Jenie First Secretary Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Mali	Mr. Cheick Sidi Ahmed Tidiane Diarra First Counsellor Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Papua New Guinea	Mr. Sebulon Kulu Deputy Secretary (Policy) Department of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Emmanuel Melpa Foreign Service Officer Department of Foreign Affairs

Russian Federation	Mr. Semyon A. Dzakhaev Counsellor Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Sierra Leone	Mr. Andrew G. Bangali Minister Counsellor and Head of Chancery Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Faroukk Al-Attar Counsellor Permanent Mission to the United Nations
Tunisia	H.E. Mr. Amor Ardhaoui Ambassador Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations

B. ADMINISTERING POWERS

New Zealand	Mr. Lindsay Watt Administrator of Tokelau
Portugal	H.E. Mr. Rui Avila Ambassador of Portugal to Australia
	Mr. José Fernando Costa Pereira First Secretary, Embassy of Portugal, Tokyo

C. REPRESENTATIVES OF NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

American Samoa	Mr. Tauese P. Sunia Lieutenant Governor
Guam	Ms. Lourdes T. Pangelinan Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor
	Mr. Leland Bettis Executive Director Guam Commission on Self-Determination
New Caledonia	Mr. Paul Neaoutyine President, Front de libération nationale kanake socialiste (FLNKS)
	Mr. Rock Wamytan Vice-President, FLNKS
	Mr. Raymond Pabouty First Vice President of Northern Province

	Mr. Roland Braweao Elected Member of Northern Province Assembly
	Mr. Richard Kaloi President of Islands Province
	Mr. André Nemia Personal Assistant to the President of FLNKS
Tokelau	Mr. Salesio Lui Ulu o Tokelau (titular leader of Tokelau) and faipule (elected representative) of Nukunonu
	Dr. Iuta Tinielu Director of Health
Non-Self-Governing Territories of the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee	Mr. Carlyle Corbin

D. UNITED NATIONS BODIES

United Nations Development Programme	Mr. Siba Kumar Das
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	Mr. Siva Siwatabau

E. INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

South Pacific Commission	Mr. Ati George Sokomanu

F. SPECIAL GUESTS

Mr. Nao Badu	Department of Political and Administrative Studies University of Papua New Guinea
Mr. Misty Baloiloi	Vice-Chancellor University of Technology Papua New Guinea
Mr. Peter Tali Coleman	Former Governor of American Samoa
Mr. Howard Graves	Chief of Bureau, Associated Press Hawaii-Guam-American Samoa and the Central Pacific Hawaii

Mr. David Hegarty	Director, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia
Mr. Robert Keith-Reid	Chairman and Publisher Islands Business International Fiji
Mr. Samuel F. McPhetres	Consultant, Saipan Northern Mariana Islands
Mr. Malama Meleisea	Director, Centre for Pacific Islands Studies University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Mr. Peter Pirie	Australia and New Zealand Studies Project University of Hawaii at Manoa, Hawaii
Ms. Alison Quentin-Baxter	Law Commission, New Zealand
Mr. Victorio Uherbelau	Presidential Assistant for Legal and International Matters, Palau
Ms. Donna Winslow	Professor of Sociology University of Ottawa, Canada
Mr. Edward P. Wolfers	Professor of Politics University of Wollongong Australia

G. REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

New Zealand International Affairs New Zealand	Ms. Alison Quentin-Baxter

H. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Asia Pacific Group New Zealand	Mr. Anthony Haas
Canadian University Service Overseas Papua New Guinea	Ms. Jean M. Eparo
Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace Papua New Guinea	Mr. Mond Ludger
Congrès populaire New Caledonia	Mr. Yann Célène Uregei

Individual and Community Rights Advocacy Forum, Inc. Papua New Guinea	Mr. Patrick Harricknen Mr. Brian Brunton
International Commission of Jurists Australia	Mr. S. Littlemore
The Melanesian Solidarity Group Papua New Guinea	Mr. Powes Parkop
National Council of Maubere Resistance Portugal	Mr. Jose Gusmão
Organization of Peoples for Indigenous Rights Guam	Mr. Ronald Rivera
PNG National Union of Students Papua New Guinea	Mr. Daniel Matthew Parep
Radio Djiido New Caledonia	Ms. Nicole Waïa

Annex IV

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA

The Regional Seminar to Review the Political, Economic and Social Conditions in the Small Island Non-Self-Governing Territories

Having met from 8 to 10 June 1993 at Port Moresby for the purpose of reviewing the political, economic and social conditions in the small island Non-Self-Governing Territories within the context of the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism,

Having heard the important message from The Right Honourable Paias Wingti, Prime Minister of Papua New Guinea, and the address by Mr. John R. Kaputin, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Papua New Guinea,

Expresses its profound gratitude to the Government and the people of Papua New Guinea for providing the Special Committee with the necessary facilities for its Pacific Regional Seminar, for the outstanding contribution they have made to the success of the Seminar and, in particular, for the very generous and kind hospitality and the warm and cordial reception accorded to the participants and observers throughout their stay in Papua New Guinea.

6th meeting at Port Moresby

10 June 1993